

REMARKS

Claims 8-14 are pending in the application. Claims 1-7 have been canceled. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 8-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lam (U.S. Patent No. 5,607,444) in view of Kim (U.S. Patent No. 6,270,524). Applicant respectfully traverses. With all due respect, it is urged that the Examiner be mindful that method claims are being presented in this patent application. In the previous Office action dated September 24, 2004, and in the Response filed December 28, 2004, the position of the long balloon and the short balloon being side by side were at issue. Apparently, notwithstanding Applicants' amendment to clarify the position of the long balloon and the short balloon, that issue remains in the present final Office action. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The Lam patent is distinguishable from claim 8 in that the Lam patent does not teach or disclose a long balloon and a short balloon that are side by side during delivery. Referring to claim 8 of the present application, it recites in pertinent part "mounting the stent on a catheter having a long balloon and a short balloon wherein the long balloon and the short balloon are positioned side by side." Nowhere in the Lam patent does it show a stent being mounted on a long balloon and a short balloon that are positioned side by side. At best, and Applicants do not agree with the Examiner's interpretation, Lam shows multiple balloons axially aligned and, once the distal portion of one of the balloons is positioned in a bifurcated vessel, only then does it become oriented to the side of one of the other balloons. This in fact does not meet the claim language of claim 8. Claim 8 specifically recites the method step of mounting the stent on a long balloon and a short balloon that are positioned side by side. This is not shown or taught in Lam. Further, again referring to claim 8, it recites in pertinent part "advancing the catheter and stent through the vascular system to a position proximal of the bifurcation." As the catheter and stent are being advanced through the vascular system to the position proximal of the


bifurcation, the stent remains mounted on the long balloon and the short balloon which are positioned side by side. This method step is not shown in Lam nor is it possible based on the construction of the Lam catheter where the balloons are oriented axially along the catheter shaft. Thus, it is respectfully urged that claim 8 is patentably distinguishable over the Lam prior art reference and that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn. Likewise, dependent claims 9-14 are distinguishable over the Lam prior art reference for the same reasons as independent claim 8.

The Kim patent does not teach any particular type of balloon catheter for use in delivery of the stent disclosed therein. Further, Kim fails to disclose any type of stent structure that arguably could be mounted on two balloons mounted side by side as set forth in claim 8 of the present application. Thus, the Kim patent adds nothing to the shortcomings of the Lam patent in maintaining the rejection of claims 8-14.

It is respectfully urged that claims 8-14 are patentably distinguishable over the cited art. If the Examiner is compelled to maintain the present rejections, it is respectfully requested that this response be entered for purposes of appeal. The undersigned can be reached at (310) 824-5555.

Respectfully submitted,

FULWIDER PATTON LEE & UTECHT, LLP

By: 
John S. Nagy
Registration No. 30,664

JSN:jeb
Howard Hughes Center
6060 Center Drive, Tenth Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90045
Telephone: (310) 824-5555
Facsimile: (310) 824-9696
Customer No. 24201
83348.1